DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 435 EA 029 686

AUTHOR Uzat, Rodney R. J.
TITLE Supervisory Behaviors That Reflect Reality: A Diversified Supervision Model.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (27th, New Orleans, LA, November 4-6, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Models; *Organizational Climate; *Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper clarifies exactly what "culture" and "change" mean to the educational system and why these terms are so important to the health, survival, and instructional improvement of educational organizations. Educational leaders must accept the fact that crafting a change-friendly, change-embracing organizational culture for continuous improvement is not only a matter of "soul craft," but also a matter of financial craft. The paper presents aspects of the culture of schools, providing overviews of studies that have examined the climate of corporations. Aspects of change are also discussed, along with what strategies must be employed for an organization to remain viable. The paper describes the interaction of culture, change, and schools and presents an instructional supervision model. The final section provides the eight stages of a diversified supervision process and what is involved in implementing this program and in reaping the benefits of a school's productive energies. (Contains 14 references.) (RJM)

Running Head: A Diversified Supervision Model

Supervisory Behaviors That Reflect Reality: A Diversified Supervision Model

Rodney R.J. Uzat

University of Southern Mississippi

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, November 4-6, 1998

Abstract

If the United States expects to remain atop the world and lay claim to yet another "American Century," its organizational leaders in education will have to catch up to its organizational leaders in business. Educational leaders must come to terms with the fact that creating a change-friendly, change-embracing organizational culture for continuous improvement is not only a matter of soul craft, but also a matter of financial craft, with deep implications for the educational system and the nation. This paper will attempt to clarify exactly what "culture" and "change" mean as well as why these terms are so important to the health, survival and instructional improvement of educational organizations. Finally, a suggested methodology referred to as "diversified supervision" will be discussed, focusing on how educational leaders can prepare for the next century by creating a culture that encourages change and continuous instructional improvement.

As the twenty-first century hurtles forward, it is obvious that the United States (and the world, for that matter) is a different place. The Industrial Age is giving way to the Information Age. Advances in transportation, communication, and the capabilities of the personal computer have made the world an overgrown locality, emasculating many of the authorities and regulations of nation-states. While no one knows for certain where the next 100 years will lead, it is likely that the future will be so significantly different from the past that it will contradict and confound many of the conceptualizations and conventions that are considered axiomatic today.

American business is already finely attuned to this, having recently clawed its way back to the financial summit of the world by beating its fiercest competitors to a paradigm shift of immense proportions and recognizing the supreme importance of organizational culture and change. Yet this reality is today--and today is already history.

If the United States expects to remain atop the world and lay claim to yet another "American Century," its organizational leaders in education will have to catch up to its organizational leaders in business. Practices and attitudes mired in outmoded educational thinking will lead to a citizenry diminished in its capacity to compete internationally. Educational leaders must come to terms with the fact that creating a change-friendly, change-embracing organizational culture for continuous improvement is not only a matter of soul craft, but also a matter of financial craft, with deep implications for the educational system and the nation. The following will attempt to clarify exactly what "culture" and "change" mean as well as why these terms are so important to the health, survival and instructional improvement of educational organizations and, ultimately, America. Finally, a suggested methodology referred to as "diversified supervision" will

be discussed, focusing on how educational leaders can prepare for the next century by creating a culture that encourages change and continuous instructional improvement.

The Culture of Schools

The term "culture" has become a revered shibboleth in management circles. It is written about in professional journals, discussed in boardrooms, and deliberated over extemporaneously at some wine and cheese functions. Yet, in order to fully understand its importance to instructional improvement, it must be carefully and comprehensively defined. Tierney described culture as "...the sum of activities in [an] organization ...[that is] relatively constant and can be understood through reason ...[that] teaches people how to behave, what to hope for, and what it means to succeed or fail " (Tierney, 1997, p. 4).

Karpicke and Murphy preferred Kaufman and Herman's (1991) approach, which suggested that organizations have their own "personalities" or manner in which staff deal with each other and those who are outside of the system (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996). More specifically, they viewed organizational culture as a "...composite of the values and beliefs of the people within the organization" (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 26).

Roberts addressed the concept of culture through Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun. According to Roberts, Attila believed that culture, or "customs" as he referred to it, was comprised of "...those things that distinguish us as a nation of strong, unified tribes" (Roberts, 1985, p. 31) in concordance with the concept of organizational personalities. As well, Roberts agreed with Karpicke and Murphy that culture was built on the values and beliefs of the individuals who labored in the organization. Yet, he was more forthcoming with respect to what

specific values were universally indispensable. Loyalty to and respect for the culture had to be part of the culture. As Attila noted, "Customs are of nations, not of individuals. ... Following our customs is a tribute to our heritage–and to our present and future." In turn, Attila demanded that "...as leaders, [we] must ensure that we have customs–strong traditions–worthy of such lasting conviction..." (Roberts, 1985, p. 32). In education, it would be difficult to argue that the instructional program - the strong and worthy tradition of teaching and learning - is not the ultimate bedrock of positive school customs.

Deal and Kennedy buoyed Tierney's assertion that culture represented the sum of all organizational activities and endeavored to further dissect and classify this "sum" into its requisite parts, which they understood to include the business environment, values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network. The authors described the 'business environment" as the dominant activities (i.e. teaching and learning in education) in which the organization had to excel if it was to succeed in its commercial arena (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). "Values" were alluded to in the same manner as Roberts had discussed them through Attila; they formed "...the heart of the corporate culture" (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 14). Deal and Kennedy added that values defined "...'success' in concrete terms for employees... and establish[ed] standards of achievement within the organization" (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 14). "Heroes" (i.e. master teachers) were individuals who served as "role models" for others due to the degree to which they embodied the values of the culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). "The rites and rituals" referred to the arranged procedures and protocol that marked daily company existence, reinforcing company values and demonstrating the expected deportment of staff (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). "The cultural network" was explained as the unofficial yet main method of organizational communication carrying

"corporate values and heroic mythology" through the rank and file (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 15).

Of course, the views expressed above with respect to culture attempt to define the state of being within an organization at its best or when striving to be its best. Deal and Kennedy pointed out that while all organizations have a culture, not all organizational cultures are strong or clear; instead, many cultures are "fragmented" resulting in mixed and conflicting messages that circumvent improvement and reduce productivity (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). For example, in a school where the administration claimed it valued the instructional program as the top priority of the institution while the "rites and rituals" included the daily interruption of classes with unscheduled announcements and the milling about of students around classroom doorways during the last five minutes of every class, the culture would be considered weak. Such cultures are in need of adjustment, repair or restructuring so that they may become effective or strong cultures. As a strong culture is clearly desirable and preferable to a weak and fragmented one, it is logical to discuss and define the former instead of the latter.

Though each of the previously expressed opinions with regard to culture took a slightly different approach and had a distinct area of emphasis, it is possible to meld the parallels and portions of all the aforementioned descriptions of culture into one consolidated and synthesized definition where culture may be referred to as a substantial, logical, consistent, unifying, accepted, and understood covenant of morals that serves to enunciate the noblest ideals and unique mission of the organization fortified by the daily protocol and personnel who live and inculcate the organizational creed.

This definition in and of itself implies the dramatic importance of culture to the overall health and viability of the organization, and more specifically, to the instructional improvement of a school. As Karpicke and Murphy noted, " [a] healthy culture that promotes student learning goes far beyond a healthy climate... [; p]roductive work takes place that results in movement toward the vision of the 'can be' " (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 27). The authors also advocated further research to analyze the relationship between an existing culture and student outcomes in order to help administrators identify and remove cultural norms within their organizations that stunt student achievement. "In essence, one culture is as good as another if the outcomes connected to culture are not clearly understood" (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 27).

Roberts discussed the importance of culture with respect to communication and induction of new staff. Attila stated, "When we establish Hunnish methods, they must be taught to our young so they will know what is expected of them in every situation. If Huns do not learn the rules, their chieftains cannot expect them to be followed" (Roberts, 1985, p. 31).

Deal and Kennedy saw culture as a dynamic rudder for steering comportment that went beyond teaching people organizational expectations. "A strong culture enables people to feel better about what they do, so they are more likely to work harder" (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 16). When the impact of cultural questions on an organization is truly and completely considered, it is easy to see why so many individuals in the management and leadership community view culture as the single most important vehicle to improvement and survival.

The Importance of Change

Another popular watchword that has become a dominant rhythm in the unremitting drumbeat of the new management lexicon is "change". Again, as with "culture", there are a

cornucopia of visions of what "change" really means. Fullan argued that as far as educational reform is concerned, it is essential to acknowledge the "confusion" between the meaning of "change" and the meaning of "progress" (Fullan, 1991). Fullan attempted to solve this "problem of meaning", as he termed it, by identifying four basic characteristics of meaningful change; need, clarity (about goals and means), complexity and quality/practicality of program (Fullan, 1991).

According to Fullan, the synergy between the needs of a new program and the needs of the school and/or the school district is fundamental. However, an accurate inventory of needs may not be apparent until implementation begins (Fullan, 1991). Individuals who are closest to the changes must discern that the needs are compelling and are being dealt with in a positive manner (Fullan, 1991). This would certainly apply to the need for teachers to be actively and directly involved in the development of their own supervision.

Fullan stated that clarity (about goals and means) "...is a perennial problem in the change process" (Fullan, 1991). The author pointed out that studies of momentous change have consistently identified difficulties with respect to clarity (Fullan, 1991). "Even when there is agreement that some kind of change is needed... the adopted change may not be at all clear about what teachers should do differently" (Fullan, 1991, p. 70). In order to have meaningful change, the goals and means of the change must be unambiguous. Teacher improvement is not likely to come about where the expectations of the supervisor are unclear or the goals of supervision do not mesh with the means.

Fullan referred to complexity as the rigor and degree of change required from staff accountable for implementation. As the author stated, "...the main idea is that any change can be examined with regard to difficulty, skill required, and extent of alterations in beliefs , teaching

strategies and use of materials" (Fullan, 1991, p. 71). Hence, the greater the complexity of change, the greater the likelihood of problems in implementation.

Quality and practicality of program was the final characteristic of change cited by Fullan. The author suggested that since " [a]mbitious projects are nearly always politically driven... the time line between the initiation decision and startup is typically too short to attend to matters of quality" (Fullan, 1991, p. 72). In order to realize meaningful change, implementation time lines need to be sufficient and practical.

When examining Fullan's elaborate definition of what change is all about, it is clear that good, meaningful change is hard work, yet "...engaging in a bad change or avoiding needed changes may be even harder on us" (Fullan, 1991, p. 73).

Peters views change from a different perspective. According to Peters, change is fluid, constant, and relentless. Change is energizing and cleansing when management "learns to love it" and ruthless and unforgiving when management resists it. Change creates paradox, challenges, new markets, high-stakes risk, and ultimately chaos (Peters, 1987). Change is the future.

Peters is one of the most articulate, and inspiring management speakers available with respect to the importance of change. From his perspective, change is a matter of survival. Peters would most likely transform the axiomatic expression of Steven Covey, "Failure to plan is planning to fail," into a blunt warning to organizational managers, that "Failure to plan *for change* is planning to go out of business." Given the recent and continuing whirlwind shifts in the global marketplace, it is difficult to argue with this premise.

Thus, "change" is more than simply viewing or doing something differently. Change is perpetual "sailing," with Fullan's definition addressing the "ship" and "crew" (the organizational

components--need, clarity, complexity, quality/practicality), and Peters' descriptions depicting the "wind" in her sails as well as the "sea" beneath her hull (the environment or inertia components– those paradox producing, challenging, market making, future forming, and chaos creating forces that are difficult to control but to which an organization must respond to successfully "stay afloat" and "reach its destination").

Culture, Change, and Schools

If the terms "culture" and "change" are truly central and substantive as management mechanisms that, when manipulated properly, will secure a successful future in the business world, then it is imperative that educational leaders begin to apply these principles to their institutions so that they may reap the same profits in learning for their students. Such fundamental and panoramic change will not come easy to a system that previously resisted the implementation of the ball-point pen. However, as Fullan (1991) and Peters (1987) were quick to note, refusal to accept and initiate change would in all likelihood result in dire consequences. At best, educators could be forced to relinquish control of their craft to segments of an increasingly impatient public. At worst, they could preside over the dissolution of the institution that serves as the cornerstone of the nation's economic battle-readiness. The answer is an unequivocal and emphatic one; educational leaders must create a school culture in their respective settings that encourages and embraces meaningful change leading to continuous instructional improvement.

Such a call to action may seem daunting to administrators - where does one begin? Revisiting Deal and Kennedy's description of the business environment (the dominant activities in which the organization has to excel if it is to succeed in its commercial endeavor) as a component of culture helps to point the way. Without a doubt, the business environment of a school refers to

the teaching and learning that takes place. Thus, the logical starting point of emphasis when attempting to affect meaningful cultural change is the classroom, and the logical practice to employ is the process of supervision.

Instructional Supervision Models

Glickman (1985) proposed an individualized supervision model referred to as "developmental supervision." He theorized that teachers could be plotted in one of four quadrants on a continuum grid based on two characteristics; their level of abstraction and their level of commitment. The four quadrants (teacher dropout - low abstraction and low commitment, unfocused worker - low abstraction and high commitment, analytical observer - high abstraction and low commitment, professional - high abstraction and high commitment) led to four different supervisory approaches.

Glatthorn (1990) recommended another individualized supervision model known as "differentiated supervision" where teachers are given the choice (within reason) of four different types of supervisory practices: clinical supervision, cooperative professional development, self-directed development, and administrative monitoring. While Glickman demanded four types of clinical supervision, Glatthorn looked to focus clinical effort on those who were in the greatest need.

Both Glickman and Glatthorn's approaches are useful, providing supervisors with different methodologies to apply to a variety of situations and personnel as well as recognizing the importance of dealing with people as individuals, yet neither addresses the cultural implications of supervisory practices. Although both emphasize that different people have different needs, hence the use of the term "differential" supervision, neither attempts to recognize that the culture of the

organization influences and is influenced by individual supervisory practices. Developmental and differential supervision of the kind expressed by Glickman and Glatthorn identifies the individual processes at work within the school system, but does not focus enough (beyond cooperative professional development) on the symbiotic interrelationships between those processes. A better solution would be a truly "diversified" supervision model.

A diversified supervision model would apply differentiated supervision practices and the concept of developmental supervision diagnosis with an eye to creating an impetus for change. Further, diversified supervision would yield continuous improvement throughout the organization based on the clearly enunciated covenant of morals forming the foundation of a strong culture. Diversified supervision would be teacher- and student- centered, yet administratively oriented, based on the dual awareness that most supervisory roles are filled by building administration and that top management is ultimately responsible for improvement (Deming, 1992). Moreover, diversified supervision would reflect a constructivist approach focusing on "... the learner's [in this case, the teacher's] direct actions, reactions, and interactions with objects, people, rules, norms and ideas result[ing] in the personal construction and reconstruction of knowledge and adaptive abilities" (Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993, p.45).

Components of a Diversified Model

The term "diversified" is preferred to "differentiated" because it reflects the fact that supervision not only needs to be different for individuals but also must be based on a set of common goals that square with the culture. While "different" connotes a part-to-part philosophy, "diverse" implies a part-to-whole mindset. The perpetual cycle of diversified supervision can be described in eight distinct but interwoven processes initiated by the principal: (a)

build/express/model/express/repeat a "super vision," (b) diagnose the nature, character and quality of staff individually and culturally, (c) create a climate conducive to collegiality and cooperation by facilitating the formulation of a supervision plan, (d) establish the administrative role as supportive, (e) integrate the administrative role as a component of a collegial supervision team, (f) encourage experimentation and adjustment of teaching as well as supervisory practices, (g) share/demand/assess information aimed at continuous improvement, and finally, (h) celebrate success.

Regardless of the type of school, the process of diversified supervision begins with building a "super vision." Fullan (1991) included vision-building as instrumental in change efforts. He cited Miles (1987) and concurred that vision encompassed two denominations, one which expressed a common vision of the way things ought to be in the school and another which represented a common vision regarding the process of change itself (Fullan, 1991). Deal and Kennedy (1982) recognized the importance of a "paramount belief" or "superordinate goal" to the success of the organizations they studied. Peters suggested that effective visions were "...inspiring... clear and challenging — and about excellence..." (Peters, 1987, pp. 401-402). As such, educational leaders would not merely be looking to address a particular school need. Instead, they would view themselves as pioneers embarking on an evangelical mission, calling upon staff with the fortitude and fire, as well as students, parents, and members of the community to join them; "[t]hese leaders were challengers, not coddlers " (Peters, 1987, p. 402). Peters agreed wholeheartedly with the sentiments of Edwin H. Land, the founder of Polaroid, who stated, "The first thing you naturally do is teach the person to feel that the undertaking is manifestly important and nearly impossible. That draws out the kind of drives that make people

strong" (Peters, 1987, p. 402). Conversely, as noted by Peters, inspiring visions focused on "the best" rather than mere numerical goals; a vision that speaks of increasing test scores by 5% is less than inspiring when compared to a vision that demands "the best" instruction (Peters, 1987).

An educational leader, then, will start the vision-building process by examining his or her own background, internalizing what things worked and what did not. From this self introspection, a core of values will emerge that the leader can begin to informally discuss with individual staff members at appropriate times, searching for common ground that serves as the foundation for a shared school mission. Finally, when the core values surface, the time has come to model and express the desired beliefs. Peters noted that " [t]he most important part is wallowing in the ideas and then, as they become increasingly clear, living them" (Peters, 1987, p. 406). Peters specifically warned against quick "sloganeering," noting that expressed values that were unclear or not carefully developed snagged leaders in inconsistencies, convicting them of hypocrisy, and more importantly compromising the covenant of morals attempting to be enculturated (Peters, 1987). However, he added that once an established vision is apparent, it was imperative for the leader to enunciate it and repeat it continuously and passionately. Peters recommended "...a three- to five- minute 'stump speech,' with many variations... [to be used] at least a couple of times a day... No opportunity is, in fact, inappropriate for reiterating the vision, using a pertinent detail that happens to be at hand... The vision lives in the intensity of the leader, an intensity that in itself draws in others" (Peters, 1987, pp. 406-407).

While it is obvious that different school environments would have different cultures, a super vision in a diversified supervision environment would inveterately be based on the ideal that the best teaching and learning practices to meet the needs of all students are the top priority of the

institution and that all school staff must work individually as well as collegially toward personal and organizational improvement. The research of Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984) cited by Kimbrough and Burkett supported that such a super vision was directly identifiable in effective schools where there existed " [a] climate of expectation for satisfactory student achievement..., [a] focus on pupil acquisition of basic school skills..., [and] resources that [could] be focused on the fundamental learning objectives of the school" (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, p. 116).

As the school vision is being built and refined, the next stage of the diversified supervision process, diagnosis of the nature, character, and quality of staff from an individual perspective as well as a cultural perspective, has already begun. As previously mentioned, Deal and Kennedy (1982) posited that the production environment (teaching and learning) represented an important component of the culture. Therefore, supervision of staff, through regular informal classroom visits serves to reinforce and model the diversified supervision commitment to the super vision, while providing the principal with the necessary opportunities to get a read on individual personalities and the prevailing culture.

Diagnosis is the key word here, as the intelligent administrator will watch and listen carefully. In their chapter concerning cultural diagnosis, Deal and Kennedy (1982) included interviewing company people as an effective means of understanding the culture. The principal would conduct these "interviews" in a covert, matter-of-fact manner while visiting classrooms, allowing appropriate situations to give rise to relevant and purposeful questions about the organization and the attitudes of those who work within it. The following scenario will attempt to clarify the value of this process.

Principal X makes three weekly visits to Teacher A's history class. On the first visit, the students are engaged in an innovative simulation activity. The class is enthusiastic, and the application of previously learned content is apparent. Principal X is suitably impressed, commending the teacher on the unquestionably positive learning environment. On the second visit, Principal X finds that the class is more subdued and the instruction less passionate (notes from the overhead); many students look terribly bored. However, Principal X is called to the office before he has a chance to talk to Teacher A. Later, after further consideration, Principal X rationalizes that Teacher A probably just had some material that students had to "get through," but just to be sure, he decides he will visit the class again shortly. The third visit finds the class in the same mundane state as the previous day.

Principal X finally gets his chance to talk to Teacher A. The principal asks why the class had changed so dramatically. Teacher A responds that he had fully intended (and would be more happy) to continue with more progressive and varied teaching methodologies, but Teacher B, a social studies colleague had expressed concern at a department meeting that Teacher A's techniques would not translate into high standardized test scores and that his new approach might "land all of us in hot water with Principal X, the board, and parents." Evidently, the other department members sat in silent agreement. When Principal X asked how Teacher C, the social studies department head, responded, Teacher A became very uncomfortable, lowered his head and quietly commented that no one wants to "mess" with Teacher B.

Principal X will have gleaned a lot of useful information about certain personalities and the culture of one area of the school from this discussion which began as an instructional issue. Undoubtedly, the manner in which he chooses to respond to this problem will be based on the

emerging values of the institution that he plans to promote. Hence, the business environment – the teaching and learning process – functions as the conduit through which the other aspects of culture (the values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network) pass, reaffirming the centrality of supervision to building a culture of change that yields continuous improvement.

When the principal has made an initial diagnosis of staff, (s)he is ready to move on to the next step of the diversified supervision process; creating a climate conducive to collegiality and cooperation by facilitating the formulation of a supervision plan. Anderson summarized the three advantages of collegiality according to research: "(1) it mobilizes human resources of the school in a joint effort to improve instruction; (2) it provides long-overdue recognition and a sense of personal achievement; and (3) it makes the introduction of instructional innovation more likely" (Anderson, 1993, p.12). The author was also quick to add that supervisors were required to provide leadership "...as teachers develop[ed] patterns of colleagueship" (Anderson, 1993, p. 12).

In diversified supervision, collegiality and cooperation are cultivated by getting teachers to think systemically rather than individually or departmentally. This will be a difficult task, as research has shown that most teachers prefer to work in isolation (Anderson, 1993). Given this fact, it is logical to surmise that the majority of teachers will analyze problems through a compartmentalized or fractured perspective (i.e., " The Math department is fine; the problem is with those English teachers..." or ... "I'm doing my job, it's time for some of those other deadbeats to start performing.") instead of a systemic one (i.e., " Teaching kids is what we all do. We can help each other with instructional practices. If a student does poorly in the early class, they bring that experience into my room – now it's my problem, too."). Again, the informal classroom visitations of the principal provide the vehicle for change.

A principal who has made a careful and accurate diagnosis of staff will already be able to conceptualize the potential supervision permutations that lay in waiting. By understanding the individuals and the culture, (s)he will identify the diversified methods of supervision that seem to fit best in the organizational framework with the personnel concerned. Naturally, this will include peer coaching, mentoring, clinical supervision, and self-guided practice. The next task is to convince individual staff members of the need for a particular supervision experience, not a difficult undertaking if the staff diagnosis has been properly developed. The following example will provide a practical application of this concept.

Teacher F, a science teacher, is an excellent classroom manager, but limited in teaching methodologies to address a variety of learning styles. Teacher G, an art teacher, is a creative practitioner, but sometimes has difficulty with classroom management. The situation presents a dynamic opportunity to encourage collegiality across disciplines, helping teachers to see the larger picture. A peer coaching relationship would be in order here if mutual respect exists between these two individuals. By merely discussing the strengths of the one teacher with the other, the principal is making each person aware of a helpful resource for improvement. If the principal's judgement is on the mark, these staff members will likely see the value of a closer collegial relationship and take the initiative to set their professional development in motion. Of course, the principal stays in contact with both individuals, monitoring progress and gently prodding where necessary. In this manner, the administrator has become a facilitator as opposed to a director of a supervision plan. Clearly, such an approach is not applicable to everyone, but it does promote the kind of initiative-taking and empowerment necessary to motivate professional staff.

Initiative-taking and empowerment was the third of Fullan's six key themes of successful change enterprises and was described as "...a social process [where] ...[d]eveloping collaborative work cultures is ...clearly central... [in order to] reduce the professional isolation of teachers [and allow for] the codification and sharing of successful practices and the provision of support " (Fullan, 1991, p. 84). Administrators have to be willing to part with power without losing control in order permit the necessary experimentation that leads to systemic improvement. In short, Fullan (1991) believed that when initiative-taking and empowerment were properly developed, an organization obsessed with continuous improvement was the inevitable and enviable result.

As well, Tom Peters felt that empowerment of staff was necessary and essential in the development of a high-energy, change-oriented culture. Managers had to listen carefully to what their people were saying and observe day-to-day goings-on. New leadership meant resisting the conventional means of controlling the organization and showing a willingness to acquiesce and delegate to the rank and file. In short, organizational leaders needed to strive for flatter, "horizontal" management, "bashing bureaucracy" relentlessly to effect change and promote improvement (Peters, 1987).

It is well worth noting here that the simple act of empowering teachers to work collegially in order to improve instruction can and probably will lead to a host of new and extremely arduous problems. As Bogotch and Bernard (1994) discovered, true collegiality in teaching requires that the participants be prepared to appraise, question, and analyze the accepted conventions of instruction, causing "confusion, strain, and misunderstandings along the way..." (p.3). However, it was through this onerous and often perplexing process that substantive change and improved

instructional effectiveness took hold, due in no small part to the relentless focus on teaching and learning.

Once a collegial climate has been developed and supervision plans have been facilitated and negotiated, the principal is ready to tackle the fourth stage of the diversified supervision process, namely, establishing the administrative role as supportive. Revisiting the example of the natural collaborative relationship between Teacher F and Teacher G is in order here.

During a routine classroom visit, the principal asks Teacher F about the progress of the collaborative efforts between Teacher F and Teacher G. Teacher F responds that the sharing of ideas through discussions over lunch and preparation periods has been helpful, but indicates that more could be gained if each teacher had the opportunity to observe the other teach. Teacher F goes on to add that he understood that such an idea was impractical, as both individuals were scheduled to teach at the same time. The principal has the unique opportunity here to establish a supportive role and, at the same time, model the super vision, by finding a way to relieve both teachers of their classroom duties to facilitate mutual observations. The principal might check the substitute schedule to see if casual help in the building is already available or she might hire a substitute through the unexpended substitute fund for one day to alternate between classes or she may even offer to cover the classes herself. Whatever the case, the principal's efforts should allow staff to see her in a supportive and collegial role instead of a judgmental, evaluative one. As Peters noted, modeling the vision convincingly and with integrity requires that the leader be visible on the battlefield (Peters, 1987).

The fifth stage of the diversified supervision process sees the principal integrate the

administrative role as a component of the collegial supervision team. Again, the practicality of this endeavor is demonstrated through the continued use of the Teachers F and G scenario.

Prior to the arranged substitute day that will allow Teachers F and G to observe each other at work, they visit with the principal, expressing concerns about their ability to collect or decide on the important data. While they have strong ideas of what types of activities they wish to observe, they are uncertain about how to maximize their efforts. Here, the principal, as a practicing, trained and experienced supervisor can fill a collegial role for the teachers. She may supply the teachers with data collection instruments and techniques, training them in supervision as she was trained, and she may even offer to help gather the data.

It is at this crucial juncture that the administrator has succeeded in reaching beyond the supportive capacity, evolving into a practical team player in the instructional improvement process, which the average teacher will be much more willing and able to relate to. At the same time, the principal is engaging in monitoring and problem-coping. Fullan applied the term "monitoring/problem coping" to both measuring outcomes throughout various processes within a system and tracking change itself. Monitoring had two roles: providing intelligence on inventive approaches and opening fresh thoughts to in-depth analysis (Fullan, 1991).

The sixth stage of the diversified supervision process focuses on leadership for change and renewal, with the principal encouraging experimentation and adjustment of teaching as well as engaging in supervisory practices. As this stage begins, a degree of control and stability has been established within the school; the super vision is known and understood by all, collegiality and cooperation are serving to erode the departmental and individual barriers that stand in the way of instructional improvement, empowerment has helped to disperse the authority necessary to

perpetuate continuous improvement, faculty have become more confident about themselves and what they are doing, and administration is trusted for its willingness to roll up its sleeves and respected for its preparedness to lead the crusade as well as for its instinctual, consistent sense of rightness. Now the principal can risk turning the entire organization upside down by challenging staff to start thinking about alternate paradigms to prepare for the future. Individualized instruction for all students, alternate models of content delivery (e.g., interdisciplinary teams, Copernican thinking) new programs, and other innovations developed by staff should be quickly piloted and evaluated. To guard against complacency or stasis, Peters exhorted upper management to embrace change, "pilot everything" and be prepared to tolerate some quick failures (Peters, 1987).

The "guiding premise," according to Peters in learning to love change is to "master paradox" (Peters, 1987, p. 391). He challenged organizational leaders to "...become 'master empiricist[s]'..." demanding new paradigms be invented and tested that questioned "...conventional management wisdom..." (Peters, 1987, p. 390). Peters pinpointed 18 paradoxes that were demonstrative of the "chaos" future businesses would have to thrive under. The list included such ideas as: "Success will stem from more love of the product–and less attachment to it.... More productivity ensues from having fewer suppliers... High quality yields lower costs... Higher quality comes from fewer inspectors... Tighter control can be achieved through more decentralization... Tighter adherence to policy is accomplished when less time is spent in the office..." (Peters, 1987, pp. 392-394).

When striving for improvement and promoting master empiricists, the school is ready to embark on the seventh stage of the diversified supervision process – –

sharing/demanding/assessing the information aimed at continuous improvement. Often W. Edwards Deming (1992) was misunderstood by educators when he suggested the elimination of numerical goals, ranking, and end-of-line inspection. Many took him to mean that measurement was wrong. Nothing could be further from the truth. What he really objected to was end-of-line inspection as the only means of measurement, as it provided the organization with no useful insight with respect to what caused the deviation in performance. Instead, Deming advocated more, varied and continuous measurement throughout the process of production in order to establish statistical control and determine the true range of natural variation within important outcomes. When this true range of variation was established, and staff began to analyze and reduce or eliminate the tangible causes of variation, Deming claimed that they had unlocked the secret of continuous improvement, gaining "profound knowledge."

Deming's theories reinforced the importance of and need for copious information with regard to student achievement and the process of learning. Unfortunately, educators have been generally mired in end of line inspection techniques. Therefore, it is imperative that empiricism as well as Deming's systems thinking and information gathering be advocated and practiced if true improvements in student achievement are to be realized.

The final stage of the diversified supervision process – celebrating success – represents the culmination and recognition of the meaningful work accomplished throughout the school. Peters stated that "... well-constructed recognition settings provide the single most important opportunity to parade and reinforce the specific kinds of new behavior one hopes others will emulate" (Peters, 1987, p. 307).

The concepts of "culture" and "change" have been instrumental in the resurrection of America as the world's ultimate business power. By applying diversified supervision, administrators will be able to simultaneously harness and untrammel the productive energies of their schools with the express purpose of fashioning a culture of change that yields continuous improvement, as "traditional supervisory approaches [can no longer] improve schooling" (Duffy, 1997, p. 79). Such an undertaking will certainly not be easy, but it is unquestionably imperative if the United States intends on preserving its productivity, market share, standard of living, entrepreneurial spirit, and, most importantly, its God-given freedom; the responsibility placed on the shoulders of educational leaders is no less than this.

References

Anderson, R. H. (1993). Clinical supervision: Its history and current context. In Anderson, R. H., & Snyder, K. J., (1993). Clinical supervision: coaching for higher performance (pp.5-18). Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Company.

Bogotch, I.E., & Bernard, J. (1994). A professor-coach relationship in educational administration: Learning to lead. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 374 521)

Colton, A.B., & Sparks-Langer, G.M. (1993). A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision making. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(1), 45-54.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rights and rituals of corporate life. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Deming, W. E. (1992). Out of the crisis. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Duffy, F. M. (1997). Supervising schooling, not teachers. Educational Leadership, 54(8), 78-83.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1990). Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision. United States: HarperCollins Publishers.

Glickman, C. D. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Karpicke, H., & Murphy, M.E. (1996). Productive school culture: Principals working from the inside. N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 80(570), 26-34.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Burkett, C, W. (1990). The principalship: Concepts and practices. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Peters, T. J. (1987). Thriving on chaos: Handbook for a management revolution. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc.

Roberts, W. (1985). Leadership secrets of Attila the Hun. New York: Warner Books Inc.

Tierney, W.G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 68(1), 1-16.

EA029686

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Supervisory Behaviors That Reflect Reality: A Diversified Supervision Model

Author(s): RODNEY R.J. UZAT

Corporate Source: The University of Southern Mississippi

Publication Date: Nov. 4/98.

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:

Printed Name/Position/Title: RODNEY R.J. UZAT

Organization/Address: 88 Shauna Way Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada R3W1P1

Telephone: (204) 669-5142

FAX:

E-Mail Address:

Date: Nov. 4, 1998

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: N/A
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name: N/A.
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: N/A

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com